

Remarks/Arguments:

An interview was conducted between Applicant's representatives and the Examiner on October 22, 2008. During the interview, Applicant's representatives explained that none of the references cited by the Examiner in the Office Action, nor any combination of those references, teaches the following features of Applicant's claim 1: (1) "outputting said decoded image data without conversion when said decoded image data has said first image resolution format" and (2) "output switching means connected to said OSD synthesis means...capable of inputting the image data having said first image resolution format." At the time of the interview, the Examiner was unable to identify disclosure in any of the references that teaches any of features (1) and (2). Thus, Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's rejections as follows.

Claims 1-4 and 6-11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Sita et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,539,120) and Kato et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,504,826). Claim 5 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as obvious over Sita, Kato and Hisatomi et al. (U.S. Pub. No. 2002/0126984). It is respectfully submitted, however, that the claims are patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth below.

Applicant's invention, as recited by claim 1, includes features which are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record, namely:

...first image resolution format conversion means of converting decoded image data decoded by said image decoding means to a first image resolution format and outputting said decoded image data thus converted when said decoded image data has an image resolution format other than said first image resolution format while ~~outputting said decoded image data without conversion when said decoded image data has said first image resolution format...~~

...output switching means connected to said OSD synthesis means...capable of inputting the image data having said first image resolution format...

(Emphases added). These features may be found, for example, in the originally filed specification at page 25, lines 15-22 and page 27, lines 15-18 and are illustrated in FIG. 1. For example, as shown in marked up FIG. 1 provided herein, 1080i image resolution format converter 40 outputs decoded image data without conversion when the image data is already in 1080i format. Further, as represented by line "X," the unconverted image data is output directly from the OSD synthesizer 50 to the image output switcher 70 without any further conversion (e.g., using 480p image resolution format converter 60 or 480i image resolution format converter 61).

Sita discloses an MPEG decoder which provides multiple standard output signals. As shown in FIG. 1A, the decoder includes an MPEG2 ATV Video Decoder 121. The ATV video decoder 121 includes a display section which "process[es] decoded picture information into a desired picture format." See Sita col. 6, lines 41-45. The converted picture information is output to primary video output interface 140. Via the primary video output interface 140, the converted picture is information is converted into (1) 1125I or 750P format and (2) 525P or 525I format. See Sita col. 6, line 58 through col. 7, line 1. However, Sita is silent with respect to outputting decoded image data without conversion when the decoded image data is already in the desired picture format. Sita is also silent with respect to outputting unconverted data in the desired picture format to an output switching means.

Kato is directed to a digital broadcasting receiver. The receiver relevantly includes an OSD synthesizing unit 26. However, Kato also does not disclose "outputting said decoded image data without conversion when said decoded image data has said first image resolution format" and "output switching means connected to said OSD synthesis means...capable of Inputting the image data having said first image resolution format," as required by Applicant's claim 1.

Accordingly, for the reasons provided above, claim 1 is patentable over the art of record.

Independent claims 10 and 11, while not identical to claim 1, include features similar to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 10 and 11 are also patentable over the art of record for the reasons provided above.

Claims 2-9 include all features of claim 1 from which they depend. Thus, claims 2-9 are also patentable over the art of record for the reasons set forth above.

In view of the amendments and arguments set forth above, the above-identified application is in condition for allowance which action is respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,



Allan Ratner, Reg. No. 19,717
Attorney for Applicant

Appln. No.: 10/529,003
Amendment Dated October 24, 2008
Reply to Office Action of July 24, 2008

MTS-3547US

Dated: October 24, 2008

Enclosure: Marked-up Fig. 1

P.O. Box 980
Valley Forge, PA 19482
(610) 407-0700

NM316115

Marked Up

Fig.1

